to the people and to deliver on the promises they make to the people.

Although the choices are not easy, I am withholding my approval from a number of Congressional spending programs that would breach the budget by $750 million in fiscal year 1973 and by nearly $2 billion in fiscal year 1974.

Each of the measures by itself might seem justifiable, or even highly desirable. But the hard fact is that they cannot be considered by themselves; each has to be considered in the broader context of the total budget—in terms of how that total may squeeze the taxpayers and how it affects the struggle to curb rising prices.

I am withholding my approval from the following bills:

LARGE-HEW AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT (H.R. 1657)

This is the second time I have vetoed inflated appropriations this year for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This amounts to a textbook example of the seeming inability or unwillingness to contain spending, which has mushroomed $9 billion this year, in addition to that growth in the other areas. The Congress amassed a budget-surplus of $7 billion, and Federal Government operations in 1972 are in my judgment justified and prudent and responsible spending policy. In my budget for fiscal year 1973, I requested that the Congress provide an increase of $2.1 billion over fiscal 1972 funds for the HEW programs contained in the bill. Of that general increase—which would have provided substantial expansion while recognizing competing priorities in other program areas—the Congress amassed a budget-breaking additional increase of $1.8 billion. I vetoed this in August because it was clearly excessive and unwarranted.

The bill now before me contains the same face amount as the measure I previously vetoed. In a partial concession to that veto, however, H.R. 1657 contains authority for the overspending to be held to $535 million—a result that would still amount to pressure for higher taxes.

This administration is second to none in its demonstrated concern and clear accomplishments in health, education, and manpower matters. My budget represented a balanced and rational approach to appropriation of funds. The administration’s shift of priorities and funds toward the human resources activities of the Government. H.R. 1657 is as unwarranted as the version I vetoed last August.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (H.R. 16071)

This bill would unnecessarily add vast new authorities for Federal programs which are already at too high levels. Instead of being effective in creating jobs or stimulating timely economic development. Public works projects have notoriously long lead times—so by the time this spending became fully effective, the need for such stimulus may be passed and the stimulation would be inflationary.

The bill would stimulate increased bureaucracy in the regional commissions by using them as a funding rather than a planning and coordinating level of government.

It would also provide assistance to workers and firms affected by Federal environmental actions. These provisions would be highly inequitable and almost impossible to administer. The unemployment benefit provision would fragment and undermine our basic Federal-State unemployment insurance system and its costs would be essentially uncontrollable. The proposed pollution control facilities loan program has only vague and unspecified objectives.

AMENDMENTS TO THE MINING AND MINERAL POLICY ACT (S. 635)

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide matching categorical grants to establish and support a mineral training institute in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico, as well as grants for related research and demonstration projects. It would fragment our research effort and destroy its priorities. Such an inflexible program would preclude us from taking advantage of the best research talents of the Nation—wherever they may be. The Federal Government’s ongoing programs of similar related kinds of research, currently funded at over $40 million annually, have provided a flexible and efficient means of meeting minerals problems of the highest national priority and can readily be adapted to continue to do so.

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ACCELERATION ACT (S. 2755)

This bill would increase Federal expenditures and raise percentage participation in categorical grant programs with specific and limited purposes. I believe this would be inconsistent with sound fiscal policy. Airport development funds have been almost quadrupled since 1970 under this administration.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1972 (S. 4018)

This measure would authorize Federal projects which would ultimately cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It contains projects never approved or recommended by the executive branch. In addition, it contains a number of objectionable features such as authorizing ill-defined and potentially costly new programs, and limiting my authority to establish criteria and standards to measure the feasibility of water resources projects in determining which ones to recommend for congressional authorization. However, a number of projects in this bill are in my judgment justified and I will recommend legislation to authorize their construction early in the next Congress.

UPGRADING OF DEPUTY U.S. MARSHALS (H.R. 13860)

This would raise the pay of some 1,500 deputy marshals by as much as 38 percent, through wholesale across-the-board upgrading. There is no justification for this highly preferential treatment, which discriminates against all other Government employees who perform work of comparable difficulty and responsibility. The pay is now the same as that of deputy marshals.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 12074)

This bill would block the orderly system of surplus land disposal established by general law and Executive order, by requiring an unusual Congressional approval procedure before any VA land holdings larger than 100 acres could be sold.

These property transfer restrictions would undermine the uniform procedures for disposing of surplus Federal property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and Executive Order 11508.

Also, the bill deals inconsistently with the serious problem of disposing of surplus Federal property under the Nation’s veterans and war dead. It contains a study of this problem at the same time it preempts the results of such a study by authorizing new burial benefits which would annually add $55 million to the Federal budget beginning next year. The Administrator of Veterans’ Affairs already is at work on such a study, which will identify the alternatives for improving burial and cemetery benefits. In the meantime, it would be unwise to add additional Federal resources as proposed by this bill.

VETERANS’ HEALTH CARE EXPANSION ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 8395)

The liberalizing features of this bill would unnecessarily add hundreds of millions of dollars to the Federal budget. It would open the VA hospital system to nonveterans and would expand the type of direct medical services available from VA. By providing direct medical services to veterans’ dependents, the bill runs counter to this Administration’s national health strategy which would provide national financing mechanisms for health care and sharply reduce the Federal Government’s role in the direct provision of services.

The bill also purports to set mandatory minimums on the number of patients treated in VA hospitals. In testimony on this bill, the Veterans’ Administration strongly objected to this provision on the grounds that it was totally unnecessary and could result in inefficient medical treatment and wasteful administrative practices. The tragic result would be a lower quality of medical care to all patients.

While I strongly support the VA health care system and will continue to encourage its improvement in the future, I cannot approve a bad bill.

REHABILITATION ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 8395)

This measure would seriously jeopardize the goals of the vocational rehabilitation program and is another example of Federal block grants. Its provisions would divert this program from its basic vocational objectives into activities that have no vocational element whatsoever or are essentially medical in character. In addition, it would create a host of new categorical programs which duplicate and overlap existing authorities and programs. Such provisions serve only to dilute the resources of the vocational rehabilitation program and impede its continued valuable achievements in restoring deserving American citizens to meaningful employment.

H.R. 8395 also would create organiza-